













## The Tribune.

## TERMS OF SUBSCRIPTION.

By Mail—In Advance—Postpaid.  
 Daily Edition, one year, \$10.00  
 Weekly Edition, one year, \$3.00  
 Single Copies, 5 Cts.  
 Foreign Postage, 50 Cts. per year.  
 Advertisers' rates on application.  
 The Tribune is published daily, except on Sundays and public holidays.  
 It is published at No. 100 North Dearborn street, Chicago, Ill.  
 Entered as second-class matter, March 10, 1877, under post office No. 100, at Chicago, Ill., under special rate of postage provided for in Act of October 3, 1879, authorized on July 16, 1878, and approved by the post office at Chicago, Ill., on July 16, 1878.  
 Accepted for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Act of October 3, 1879, authorized on July 16, 1878, and approved by the post office at Chicago, Ill., on July 16, 1878.

## TRIBUNE BRANCH OFFICES.

THE CHICAGO TRIBUNE has established branch offices for the receipt of subscriptions and advertisements at the following places:  
 NEW YORK—Room 20 Tribune Building, F. T. McFadden, Manager.  
 PHILADELPHIA—No. 100 N. 3rd St., J. H. McFadden, Manager.  
 LONDON—No. 100 N. 3rd St., J. H. McFadden, Manager.  
 SAN FRANCISCO—No. 100 N. 3rd St., J. H. McFadden, Manager.

## AMUSEMENTS.

**McVicker's Theatre.**  
 "The Great Train Robbery."  
**Healey's Theatre.**  
 "The Great Train Robbery."  
**Harvey's Theatre.**  
 "The Great Train Robbery."  
**Clark's Theatre.**  
 "The Great Train Robbery."  
**Coliseum Novelty Theatre.**  
 "The Great Train Robbery."  
**McCormick Hall.**  
 "The Great Train Robbery."

## SOCIETY MEETINGS.

**KEYSTONE LODGE, No. 20, A. F. & A. M.**  
 Regular communication, Wednesday, Feb. 6, at 7:30 P. M., in the hall of the lodge, at the corner of Madison and Dearborn streets.  
**CHICAGO CHAPTER, No. 127, E. A. M.—134**  
 Regular communication, Wednesday, Feb. 6, at 7:30 P. M., in the hall of the chapter, at the corner of Madison and Dearborn streets.  
**WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 6, 1878.**

## CHICAGO MARKET SUMMARY.

The Chicago market was generally quiet and firm yesterday. Mess pork closed 2 1/2c per lb. higher, at \$10.67 1/2 for March and \$10.62 1/2 for April. Lard closed 5c per 100 lb. higher, at \$7.75 for March and \$7.70 for April. Beef was steady, at \$3.25 for 100 lb. for boxed shoulders and 5c for short ribs. Whisky was steady, at \$1.05 per gallon. Flour was quiet. Wheat closed at \$1.03 1/2 for March and \$1.03 1/2 for April. Corn closed 1/4c higher, at 30c per bushel. Oats closed 1/4c higher, at 25c per bushel. Rye was steady, at 50c per bushel. Barley closed 1/4c higher, at 45c per bushel. Hops were dull and closed weak, at \$3.75 for 100 lb. in greenbacks. At 10c. British consols, 74 1/2. Greenbacks at \$1.05 and sterling exchange at \$4.85.

## Greenbacks at the New York Stock Exchange yesterday closed at 98.

The swift lapse of time yesterday found Justice again knocking at the cell-door of the desperado RANDE at Galesburg. In this instance she was not told to come some other time, and an attempt is accordingly being made in the Knox County Circuit Court to secure a jury to try the notorious prisoner. Seven farmers have been found and accepted who had formed no opinion as to the guilt of the accused, and yesterday's proceedings promise to be monopolized in obtaining a legal complement. The appearance and bearing of the atrocious brigand have been noted by our correspondent.

A significant statement was made by the British Minister of Foreign Affairs in the House of Lords yesterday, to the effect that England is not without complete assurance of powerful support and co-operation in the position to be taken at the Vienna Conference. Lord Derby undoubtedly referred to Austria, or at least was quite willing that his language should be so construed. Austria is represented as ready and willing to join England in the movement to oppose the designs of Russia as indicated in the armistice conditions, and as only awaiting the passage by Parliament of the supplementary vote by decisive majority before openly announcing an alliance with England.

The taking of testimony in the ANDREWS case at New Orleans was completed yesterday, and the arguments will probably be finished to-day. So far as the press reports of the trial would indicate, the Democratic reformers who hovered around the returning Board during the electoral campaign were badly served by direct evidence as to their fraudulent actions and intentions. A dispatch received at Washington yesterday predicts that none of the members of the Board will be convicted, for the reason that, notwithstanding the one-sided manner in which the case was set up and the jury selected, there cannot be found twelve men in New Orleans who can agree upon a verdict of guilty.

Extreme heat in the case of Quebec, in the north, and of Lee County, Miss., in the southern part of the American continent. Both are sufferers from the prevailing tendency of officials to steal as much of the people's money as they can get their hands on and get away with. It has been discovered by a Committee of Auditors appointed to examine the city finances of Quebec that \$145,000 of city debentures cannot be accounted for and that \$23,000 in cash, which should be in the hands of the Treasurer, is nowhere to be found. Down in Lee County, Miss., the people have enjoyed the blessings of seven years of uninterrupted defalcation in the Sheriff's office, their last experience in that line aggregating \$40,000.

The proposition to vote a war grant of \$5,000,000, which England may flout in the face of Europe at the Vienna Conference, was debated in the House of Commons yesterday for and against. Sir William Harcourt, Liberal, made a speech in

leading speech of the day, declaring that if England backed two or three years ago by the Conference, the avowed enemy of Russian ambition in the East, such an attitude meant war; but, if, on the contrary, the Government was sincere in its professed desire for a durable peace, the basis of its policy at the Conference must be a recognition of the fact that the independence and integrity of the Ottoman Empire had ceased. It seems incredible that the ability to perceive the inevitable should be limited to the Liberal element in British politics, and that there should be any considerable following in Parliament for a Ministry that formulates its Eastern policy upon the exploded theory that Turkey can be maintained as a European Power.

The Agricultural Society of Winnebago County, Illinois, dropped its politics some-what, and invited to JERRY DAVIS to come and address the people at Rockford during fair-time. The popular orator immediately manifested to the appearance of J. D. on a public rostrum in Rockford was so unmistakable that the proposed speaker was obliged to send his compliments and regrets. The crisis which has ever since hovered over the ministry of rural science in Winnebago County was finally precipitated last night, when, before the assembled dignitaries of the Association, Mr. H. P. KRAVALL, Secretary, who in the JERRY DAVIS fiasco was put down very much by a Mr. MACDONALD, got up both on his ear and his feet, kicked back his flaccid across the bloody chasm, proclaimed his everlasting contempt of all enemies of his pastoral-political policy, and besought himself of all connection with the Society. The meeting is said to have "got red hot" upon the subject of the election of a new Secretary. There is hope that this stormy paragon has relieved Winnebago of the alien passions which have so mangled it "hitherto heretofore."

Poor Greece seems to have made a grievous blunder in inaugurating a hostile policy just at the time when its armistice had been declared. The Hellenic Government either waited much too long or not quite long enough. As the case now stands the predicament is a serious one, and nothing but the humane offices of the Powers can prevent the Grecian seaports from suffering severe punishment. The dispatch of troops to the provinces has been regarded by the Turkish Government as a declaration of war, and HORACE PAISH, in charge of the Black Sea fleet, has been ordered to Athens to bring about the Turkish Minister, and it may be to bombard the undefended cities of the coast. Great consternation prevails at the Capital, and there appears to be no escape out of the dilemma except by the withdrawal of the troops from Macedonia and Thessaly, and the entire suspension of hostile operations. It is evident from the remarks of Lord DUBBY yesterday that the panic-stricken Hellenes have little hope for in the way of assistance or protection at the hands of England, and that if HORACE PAISH's fleet is not turned loose upon the open and defenseless cities of Greece it will be because of the interference of Powers which have never professed undying devotion to the cause of Grecian liberty and progress.

## JAY GOULD AND THE SILVER BILL.

JAY GOULD, the gold gambler, has taken advantage of his ownership of the columns of the New York Tribune to ventilate his views upon the subject of the remonetization of silver, and, as might be expected, he has accomplished it with a degree of assumption and audacity that are remarkable even in a man possessing his generous stock of brass. He starts off with the assumption that the payment of the Government bonds in silver will be a violation of the national faith, though why any violation of faith, maintaining or otherwise, should depend upon so very clear. If his assumption be true, then the Government must have agreed to pay in something else than silver. We may regard his assumption in two ways. First, as a matter of fact. The acts authorizing the issue of these bonds expressly declare that the principal and interest are payable in coin, and the Supreme Court has more than decided that a contract for payment of a certain sum in gold and silver is as payable, no matter with what kind of coin they may have been bought. Will JAY GOULD deny that silver is coin? There is and can be no question on that point. How, then, is it a violation of faith for the Government to pay its bonds in precisely the money it agreed to, and when, to avoid any possible mistake on this point, the conditions were set forth and written on the very face of the bonds? Second, as a matter of fact, is JAY GOULD exactly the right stamp of man to set himself up as the self-avowed protector of the national faith? Is he a bright and shining representative of ideal honesty that he can arise in public and charge other men with being repudiators or enemies of the country's honor? By what condition of honor or virtue does this cold-blooded, grasping, dishonest, ruthless speculator, railroad-wrecker, gold-gambler and Black-Friday conspirator, always at war with the commercial world, deliberately allowing his broker-victims to be sold out, and now prostituting the columns of Mr. GAZETTE's paper to his own purposes, set himself up as the protector and custodian of the national honor?

Again, says JAY GOULD, if the BOND bill becomes a law it will destroy the credit of the United States for a century, and will deprive business men of one-tenth of the value of goods sold on time or money loaned. Mr. GOULD talks glibly of time, forgetting what may happen in a century. He seems to forget the limits of time included in a hundred years and the immense and radical changes that are likely to occur. If he would remember that the Revolution occurred only a hundred years ago, and that in a hundred years from now there will be absolutely nothing left of him, with the possible exception of some very unsavory memories, he might hesitate before making any prophecy as to what a century may bring forth. His declaration as to the depreciation of value of goods would carry some force with it if it did not in the first instance, proceed from a man who has no sympathies with commercial men, and whose interests are associated alone with stock-gamblers, and, in the second instance, it were not based upon false premises. He proceeds upon the assumption that remonetization will have no effect in reducing gold or enhancing silver, and no influence on the relations of the value of silver to that of gold to bring them nearer to each other, and upon such a gratuitous assumption as this he bases the rest of the gold claim before every one who is not in sympathy with their operations with filthy blackguardism. In violation of

all laws of human experience, of all laws of political economy, and of all principles of supply and demand, they assume that if a market is opened for millions of silver coin among a commercial people using as much money as any other, with no metal using in circulation, it will not add anything to its value. It is a barefaced, shallow assumption, characteristic either of the history of money and the laws of supply and demand, or of an intelligent person who is dishonest for a purpose, in which latter case the case might possibly fit Mr. JAY GOULD. "Debauched currency," "dishonest dollars," "dishonest gold," "dishonest silver," howls JAY GOULD through columns after columns of the gold organ which he owns. By what right does JAY GOULD assume to fix the relative value as between gold and silver, when one is a legal tender and the other is not? By what authority does he absolutely fix relative values by putting gold up and silver down? If we are going to even up, why not bring about that result by evening silver up and gold down? Silver is the older coin, and the real standard. The gold dollar is a modern institution; the silver was the dollar of our fathers. There are 100 cents in a silver dollar, just as there are in a gold dollar. For the past twenty years it has been much in direction as gold and silver, and as gold and silver, it is to-day as real a standard as before JAY GOULD came to fix its value by depreciating it, would it not be well for him to wait until both are legal-tender? It may save him a great deal of trouble in evening up in favor of gold.

JAY GOULD's most crushing argument is to the effect that the remonetization of silver will destroy the Republic in a year. We have already seen this eminent reformer in dire apprehension for the rights of business men with whom he has nothing in common, and for the national faith for which he has no concern, but for the interests of true religion. We now behold him trembling for the Republican party. What has he done for that party that he should be anxious for it? What has the New York Tribune done of late for the party, except to try to destroy it, that it should be alarmed? What does he mean by the destruction of the party? Is it to move away, bag and baggage, and leave "no sign"? Are the members to be left as a party, and the Democrats? Is it to be reorganized, and, if so, will it not be the same party? Is it to be absorbed by the Democratic party, and, if so, will it not dominate it? Is its destruction to be like that of the Whig party, and, if so, will JAY GOULD inform us how much the Democracy gained by it? Upon this branch of his argument JAY GOULD has wasted time. He is not such a shining Republican that he will frighten any one by setting up his political gasconade. It will be regarded as little as his abuse and blackguardism which are directed against three-fourths of the American people, and those three-fourths embracing the industrious, hard-working, producing classes, not the money-lenders, coupon-outlets, and shysters.

## HARRISON'S CIVIL SERVICE.

OUR CARTER has done it. The great problem which has defied solution by the ablest law-givers and philosophers for centuries has been mastered at last by the distinguished statesman, and yet all this at Chicago in representing her in Congress. The question in every Government that has ever existed has been how to establish a Civil Service that would unite the three great requisites—honesty, capacity, and fidelity; how to secure the services of the best officers; how to make them secure in their offices during fidelity to duty; and how to do all this and leave the doors to official life open to all. This has been pronounced to be such an impossibility that all attempts at its reform have been abandoned. England tried it repeatedly during the last century; France admits that all her efforts have proved failures; Austria has vainly struggled to relieve herself of an incompetent and corrupt service; while in Russia and Turkey, Spain and Germany, the work has had such a hopeless outlook that no serious effort has been made to do it. The nations of Europe have written their names high on the pillars of fame. But the nations of Europe have never had a HARRISON. They have had great men, able men, but nowhere is there recorded the name of HARRISON—CARTER HARRISON; he is peculiarly and exclusively the property of America.

Speaker RANDALL has many things to answer for, and his ambition leads him to avoid any possible mistake on this point, the conditions were set forth and written on the very face of the bonds? Second, as a matter of fact, is JAY GOULD exactly the right stamp of man to set himself up as the self-avowed protector of the national faith? Is he a bright and shining representative of ideal honesty that he can arise in public and charge other men with being repudiators or enemies of the country's honor? By what condition of honor or virtue does this cold-blooded, grasping, dishonest, ruthless speculator, railroad-wrecker, gold-gambler and Black-Friday conspirator, always at war with the commercial world, deliberately allowing his broker-victims to be sold out, and now prostituting the columns of Mr. GAZETTE's paper to his own purposes, set himself up as the protector and custodian of the national honor?

Again, says JAY GOULD, if the BOND bill becomes a law it will destroy the credit of the United States for a century, and will deprive business men of one-tenth of the value of goods sold on time or money loaned. Mr. GOULD talks glibly of time, forgetting what may happen in a century. He seems to forget the limits of time included in a hundred years and the immense and radical changes that are likely to occur. If he would remember that the Revolution occurred only a hundred years ago, and that in a hundred years from now there will be absolutely nothing left of him, with the possible exception of some very unsavory memories, he might hesitate before making any prophecy as to what a century may bring forth. His declaration as to the depreciation of value of goods would carry some force with it if it did not in the first instance, proceed from a man who has no sympathies with commercial men, and whose interests are associated alone with stock-gamblers, and, in the second instance, it were not based upon false premises. He proceeds upon the assumption that remonetization will have no effect in reducing gold or enhancing silver, and no influence on the relations of the value of silver to that of gold to bring them nearer to each other, and upon such a gratuitous assumption as this he bases the rest of the gold claim before every one who is not in sympathy with their operations with filthy blackguardism. In violation of

## THE PLAQUE-SPOT ON THE CUSTOMS SERVICE.

When it was discovered that TREXED had robbed New York of twenty-five or thirty million dollars there was great excitement throughout the borders of this municipality. Indignation meetings were convened; honest men of all political parties were urged to unite in a crusade against the scoundrel who had grown rich off the substance of taxpayers, and the press flung anathemas against every member from highest to lowest, of the band of thieves. So terrible was the onslaught that corrupt members of the Ring, shrank in terror of public view, and one actually surrendered his life in dread and horror of the avenging arm of justice invoked by the united voices of the plundered and outraged people. In a few months after the inauguration of the reform movement the chiefs of the Ring were hurled from power and lodged in jail or forced to become wanderers in foreign lands, fugitives from justice.

In 1871 a Commission was created by President Grant to inquire into the conduct of the Civil Service of the country. After a laborious, thorough investigation of the methods pursued in the collection of the customs revenue, that Commission reported that, in its opinion, the Government was swindled out of one-fourth—thirty millions of dollars per annum—of the revenue due it as a single port of New York! Did the merchants, the press, or the people of New York City manifest any surprise at this disclosure of monstrous corruption? No. They were as silent as the grave on the subject. They did not demand that the stealing should be stopped. They did not demand the removal of one of the customs officers under whose eyes the robbery had proceeded and was still proceeding. They did not demand the prosecution, conviction, and punishment of a single one of the pilfering importers. They did not even ask for an investigation. They folded their arms and said—nothing! From the date of the report of the Customs Commission down to the time of the creation of the JAY COMMISSION—six years—there is not a particle of evidence to show that any reform was attempted in the methods of collecting the revenue at the New York Custom-House. The presumption is that meantime, from 1871 to 1877, at least one hundred and fifty

million dollars of revenue was lost to the Government through the inefficiency and corruption of the servants of the Treasury Department at the single port of New York! The statement is almost too monstrous for human credulity; but it is no less monstrous than the fact, such an opinion as that of the Customs Commission, could be published without eliciting an expression of surprise or forcing a passionate outburst of indignation from either the merchants, the press, or the people of New York City. How is it that TREXED was seized, tried, convicted, and sent to the Penitentiary,—pursued to the ends of the earth and brought back,—for stealing \$5,000,000 per annum, while the pilfering merchants of New York City were permitted to steal \$50,000,000 per annum with perfect impunity? Why was New York justice so alert and active in the one case and so inert and slumberous in the other? Is the man who swears to a false (under-valued) invoice before one Deputy-Collector of Customs, and bribes another to clear his merchandise at half its value to cheat the Government of its revenue, any less a liar and swindler than the man who stole the city's revenue and divided the plunder with his rascally gang of contractors? It is a fact, however, that TREXED was sent to prison, and it is equally true that his confederates in crime, the robbers of the customs revenue, are not only at large, but are still in the high places of social and mercantile life.

It is claimed that it was easy to catch TREXED and impossible to detect and bring to justice the ring of pilfering importers? We deny it. There never was a stronger Ring than that of the TREXED gang. They were entrenched behind the breastwork of a political supremacy as old as the corporation of the City of New York. They controlled the State, and administered patronage to the amount of millions of dollars; they owned the Courts, and through the decrees of Judges, purchased the influence of the vast network of railways that centre in the metropolis. Yet it was only necessary to arouse and unite the masses of the people in one single, well-directed effort to crush this monster of corruption and misrule as a man, and he should be selected by him for office. President HAYES has thus far put this Congressional dictation at defiance. In one case the Senate refused to consent to an appointment he had made, and under the Tenure-of-Office law—a law of most questionable constitutionality—has kept a man in office after the President had decided him unfit to hold it. Mr. HARRISON's plan retains the principle of Congressional selection and appointment, and makes a man who shall not be selected by him for office. President HAYES has thus far put this Congressional dictation at defiance. In one case the Senate refused to consent to an appointment he had made, and under the Tenure-of-Office law—a law of most questionable constitutionality—has kept a man in office after the President had decided him unfit to hold it. Mr. HARRISON's plan retains the principle of Congressional selection and appointment, and makes a man who shall not be selected by him for office. President HAYES has thus far put this Congressional dictation at defiance. In one case the Senate refused to consent to an appointment he had made, and under the Tenure-of-Office law—a law of most questionable constitutionality—has kept a man in office after the President had decided him unfit to hold it. Mr. HARRISON's plan retains the principle of Congressional selection and appointment, and makes a man who shall not be selected by him for office. President HAYES has thus far put this Congressional dictation at defiance. In one case the Senate refused to consent to an appointment he had made, and under the Tenure-of-Office law—a law of most questionable constitutionality—has kept a man in office after the President had decided him unfit to hold it. Mr. HARRISON's plan retains the principle of Congressional selection and appointment, and makes a man who shall not be selected by him for office. President HAYES has thus far put this Congressional dictation at defiance. In one case the Senate refused to consent to an appointment he had made, and under the Tenure-of-Office law—a law of most questionable constitutionality—has kept a man in office after the President had decided him unfit to hold it. Mr. HARRISON's plan retains the principle of Congressional selection and appointment, and makes a man who shall not be selected by him for office. President HAYES has thus far put this Congressional dictation at defiance. In one case the Senate refused to consent to an appointment he had made, and under the Tenure-of-Office law—a law of most questionable constitutionality—has kept a man in office after the President had decided him unfit to hold it. Mr. HARRISON's plan retains the principle of Congressional selection and appointment, and makes a man who shall not be selected by him for office. President HAYES has thus far put this Congressional dictation at defiance. In one case the Senate refused to consent to an appointment he had made, and under the Tenure-of-Office law—a law of most questionable constitutionality—has kept a man in office after the President had decided him unfit to hold it. Mr. HARRISON's plan retains the principle of Congressional selection and appointment, and makes a man who shall not be selected by him for office. President HAYES has thus far put this Congressional dictation at defiance. In one case the Senate refused to consent to an appointment he had made, and under the Tenure-of-Office law—a law of most questionable constitutionality—has kept a man in office after the President had decided him unfit to hold it. Mr. HARRISON's plan retains the principle of Congressional selection and appointment, and makes a man who shall not be selected by him for office. President HAYES has thus far put this Congressional dictation at defiance. In one case the Senate refused to consent to an appointment he had made, and under the Tenure-of-Office law—a law of most questionable constitutionality—has kept a man in office after the President had decided him unfit to hold it. Mr. HARRISON's plan retains the principle of Congressional selection and appointment, and makes a man who shall not be selected by him for office. President HAYES has thus far put this Congressional dictation at defiance. In one case the Senate refused to consent to an appointment he had made, and under the Tenure-of-Office law—a law of most questionable constitutionality—has kept a man in office after the President had decided him unfit to hold it. Mr. HARRISON's plan retains the principle of Congressional selection and appointment, and makes a man who shall not be selected by him for office. President HAYES has thus far put this Congressional dictation at defiance. In one case the Senate refused to consent to an appointment he had made, and under the Tenure-of-Office law—a law of most questionable constitutionality—has kept a man in office after the President had decided him unfit to hold it. Mr. HARRISON's plan retains the principle of Congressional selection and appointment, and makes a man who shall not be selected by him for office. President HAYES has thus far put this Congressional dictation at defiance. In one case the Senate refused to consent to an appointment he had made, and under the Tenure-of-Office law—a law of most questionable constitutionality—has kept a man in office after the President had decided him unfit to hold it. Mr. HARRISON's plan retains the principle of Congressional selection and appointment, and makes a man who shall not be selected by him for office. President HAYES has thus far put this Congressional dictation at defiance. In one case the Senate refused to consent to an appointment he had made, and under the Tenure-of-Office law—a law of most questionable constitutionality—has kept a man in office after the President had decided him unfit to hold it. Mr. HARRISON's plan retains the principle of Congressional selection and appointment, and makes a man who shall not be selected by him for office. President HAYES has thus far put this Congressional dictation at defiance. In one case the Senate refused to consent to an appointment he had made, and under the Tenure-of-Office law—a law of most questionable constitutionality—has kept a man in office after the President had decided him unfit to hold it. Mr. HARRISON's plan retains the principle of Congressional selection and appointment, and makes a man who shall not be selected by him for office. President HAYES has thus far put this Congressional dictation at defiance. In one case the Senate refused to consent to an appointment he had made, and under the Tenure-of-Office law—a law of most questionable constitutionality—has kept a man in office after the President had decided him unfit to hold it. Mr. HARRISON's plan retains the principle of Congressional selection and appointment, and makes a man who shall not be selected by him for office. President HAYES has thus far put this Congressional dictation at defiance. In one case the Senate refused to consent to an appointment he had made, and under the Tenure-of-Office law—a law of most questionable constitutionality—has kept a man in office after the President had decided him unfit to hold it. Mr. HARRISON's plan retains the principle of Congressional selection and appointment, and makes a man who shall not be selected by him for office. President HAYES has thus far put this Congressional dictation at defiance. In one case the Senate refused to consent to an appointment he had made, and under the Tenure-of-Office law—a law of most questionable constitutionality—has kept a man in office after the President had decided him unfit to hold it. Mr. HARRISON's plan retains the principle of Congressional selection and appointment, and makes a man who shall not be selected by him for office. President HAYES has thus far put this Congressional dictation at defiance. In one case the Senate refused to consent to an appointment he had made, and under the Tenure-of-Office law—a law of most questionable constitutionality—has kept a man in office after the President had decided him unfit to hold it. Mr. HARRISON's plan retains the principle of Congressional selection and appointment, and makes a man who shall not be selected by him for office. President HAYES has thus far put this Congressional dictation at defiance. In one case the Senate refused to consent to an appointment he had made, and under the Tenure-of-Office law—a law of most questionable constitutionality—has kept a man in office after the President had decided him unfit to hold it. Mr. HARRISON's plan retains the principle of Congressional selection and appointment, and makes a man who shall not be selected by him for office. President HAYES has thus far put this Congressional dictation at defiance. In one case the Senate refused to consent to an appointment he had made, and under the Tenure-of-Office law—a law of most questionable constitutionality—has kept a man in office after the President had decided him unfit to hold it. Mr. HARRISON's plan retains the principle of Congressional selection and appointment, and makes a man who shall not be selected by him for office. President HAYES has thus far put this Congressional dictation at defiance. In one case the Senate refused to consent to an appointment he had made, and under the Tenure-of-Office law—a law of most questionable constitutionality—has kept a man in office after the President had decided him unfit to hold it. Mr. HARRISON's plan retains the principle of Congressional selection and appointment, and makes a man who shall not be selected by him for office. President HAYES has thus far put this Congressional dictation at defiance. In one case the Senate refused to consent to an appointment he had made, and under the Tenure-of-Office law—a law of most questionable constitutionality—has kept a man in office after the President had decided him unfit to hold it. Mr. HARRISON's plan retains the principle of Congressional selection and appointment, and makes a man who shall not be selected by him for office. President HAYES has thus far put this Congressional dictation at defiance. In one case the Senate refused to consent to an appointment he had made, and under the Tenure-of-Office law—a law of most questionable constitutionality—has kept a man in office after the President had decided him unfit to hold it. Mr. HARRISON's plan retains the principle of Congressional selection and appointment, and makes a man who shall not be selected by him for office. President HAYES has thus far put this Congressional dictation at defiance. In one case the Senate refused to consent to an appointment he had made, and under the Tenure-of-Office law—a law of most questionable constitutionality—has kept a man in office after the President had decided him unfit to hold it. Mr. HARRISON's plan retains the principle of Congressional selection and appointment, and makes a man who shall not be selected by him for office. President HAYES has thus far put this Congressional dictation at defiance. In one case the Senate refused to consent to an appointment he had made, and under the Tenure-of-Office law—a law of most questionable constitutionality—has kept a man in office after the President had decided him unfit to hold it. Mr. HARRISON's plan retains the principle of Congressional selection and appointment, and makes a man who shall not be selected by him for office. President HAYES has thus far put this Congressional dictation at defiance. In one case the Senate refused to consent to an appointment he had made, and under the Tenure-of-Office law—a law of most questionable constitutionality—has kept a man in office after the President had decided him unfit to hold it. Mr. HARRISON's plan retains the principle of Congressional selection and appointment, and makes a man who shall not be selected by him for office. President HAYES has thus far put this Congressional dictation at defiance. In one case the Senate refused to consent to an appointment he had made, and under the Tenure-of-Office law—a law of most questionable constitutionality—has kept a man in office after the President had decided him unfit to hold it. Mr. HARRISON's plan retains the principle of Congressional selection and appointment, and makes a man who shall not be selected by him for office. President HAYES has thus far put this Congressional dictation at defiance. In one case the Senate refused to consent to an appointment he had made, and under the Tenure-of-Office law—a law of most questionable constitutionality—has kept a man in office after the President had decided him unfit to hold it. Mr. HARRISON's plan retains the principle of Congressional selection and appointment, and makes a man who shall not be selected by him for office. President HAYES has thus far put this Congressional dictation at defiance. In one case the Senate refused to consent to an appointment he had made, and under the Tenure-of-Office law—a law of most questionable constitutionality—has kept a man in office after the President had decided him unfit to hold it. Mr. HARRISON's plan retains the principle of Congressional selection and appointment, and makes a man who shall not be selected by him for office. President HAYES has thus far put this Congressional dictation at defiance. In one case the Senate refused to consent to an appointment he had made, and under the Tenure-of-Office law—a law of most questionable constitutionality—has kept a man in office after the President had decided him unfit to hold it. Mr. HARRISON's plan retains the principle of Congressional selection and appointment, and makes a man who shall not be selected by him for office. President HAYES has thus far put this Congressional dictation at defiance. In one case the Senate refused to consent to an appointment he had made, and under the Tenure-of-Office law—a law of most questionable constitutionality—has kept a man in office after the President had decided him unfit to hold it. Mr. HARRISON's plan retains the principle of Congressional selection and appointment, and makes a man who shall not be selected by him for office. President HAYES has thus far put this Congressional dictation at defiance. In one case the Senate refused to consent to an appointment he had made, and under the Tenure-of-Office law—a law of most questionable constitutionality—has kept a man in office after the President had decided him unfit to hold it. Mr. HARRISON's plan retains the principle of Congressional selection and appointment, and makes a man who shall not be selected by him for office. President HAYES has thus far put this Congressional dictation at defiance. In one case the Senate refused to consent to an appointment he had made, and under the Tenure-of-Office law—a law of most questionable constitutionality—has kept a man in office after the President had decided him unfit to hold it. Mr. HARRISON's plan retains the principle of Congressional selection and appointment, and makes a man who shall not be selected by him for office. President HAYES has thus far put this Congressional dictation at defiance. In one case the Senate refused to consent to an appointment he had made, and under the Tenure-of-Office law—a law of most questionable constitutionality—has kept a man in office after the President had decided him unfit to hold it. Mr. HARRISON's plan retains the principle of Congressional selection and appointment, and makes a man who shall not be selected by him for office. President HAYES has thus far put this Congressional dictation at defiance. In one case the Senate refused to consent to an appointment he had made, and under the Tenure-of-Office law—a law of most questionable constitutionality—has kept a man in office after the President had decided him unfit to hold it. Mr. HARRISON's plan retains the principle of Congressional selection and appointment, and makes a man who shall not be selected by him for office. President HAYES has thus far put this Congressional dictation at defiance. In one case the Senate refused to consent to an appointment he had made, and under the Tenure-of-Office law—a law of most questionable constitutionality—has kept a man in office after the President had decided him unfit to hold it. Mr. HARRISON's plan retains the principle of Congressional selection and appointment, and makes a man who shall not be selected by him for office. President HAYES has thus far put this Congressional dictation at defiance. In one case the Senate refused to consent to an appointment he had made, and under the Tenure-of-Office law—a law of most questionable constitutionality—has kept a man in office after the President had decided him unfit to hold it. Mr. HARRISON's plan retains the principle of Congressional selection and appointment, and makes a man who shall not be selected by him for office. President HAYES has thus far put this Congressional dictation at defiance. In one case the Senate refused to consent to an appointment he had made, and under the Tenure-of-Office law—a law of most questionable constitutionality—has kept a man in office after the President had decided him unfit to hold it. Mr. HARRISON's plan retains the principle of Congressional selection and appointment, and makes a man who shall not be selected by him for office. President HAYES has thus far put this Congressional dictation at defiance. In one case the Senate refused to consent to an appointment he had made, and under the Tenure-of-Office law—a law of most questionable constitutionality—has kept a man in office after the President had decided him unfit to hold it. Mr. HARRISON's plan retains the principle of Congressional selection and appointment, and makes a man who shall not be selected by him for office. President HAYES has thus far put this Congressional dictation at defiance. In one case the Senate refused to consent to an appointment he had made, and under the Tenure-of-Office law—a law of most questionable constitutionality—has kept a man in office after the President had decided him unfit to hold it. Mr. HARRISON's plan retains the principle of Congressional selection and appointment, and makes a man who shall not be selected by him for office. President HAYES has thus far put this Congressional dictation at defiance. In one case the Senate refused to consent to an appointment he had made, and under the Tenure-of-Office law—a law of most questionable constitutionality—has kept a man in office after the President had decided him unfit to hold it. Mr. HARRISON's plan retains the principle of Congressional selection and appointment, and makes a man who shall not be selected by him for office. President HAYES has thus far put this Congressional dictation at defiance. In one case the Senate refused to consent to an appointment he had made, and under the Tenure-of-Office law—a law of most questionable constitutionality—has kept a man in office after the President had decided him unfit to hold it. Mr. HARRISON's plan retains the principle of Congressional selection and appointment, and makes a man who shall not be selected by him for office. President HAYES has thus far put this Congressional dictation at defiance. In one case the Senate refused to consent to an appointment he had made, and under the Tenure-of-Office law—a law of most questionable constitutionality—has kept a man in office after the President had decided him unfit to hold it. Mr. HARRISON's plan retains the principle of Congressional selection and appointment, and makes a man who shall not be selected by him for office. President HAYES has thus far put this Congressional dictation at defiance. In one case the Senate refused to consent to an appointment he had made, and under the Tenure-of-Office law—a law of most questionable constitutionality—has kept a man in office after the President had decided him unfit to hold it. Mr. HARRISON's plan retains the principle of Congressional selection and appointment, and makes a man who shall not be selected by him for office. President HAYES has thus far put this Congressional dictation at defiance. In one case the Senate refused to consent to an appointment he had made, and under the Tenure-of-Office law—a law of most questionable constitutionality—has kept a man in office after the President had decided him unfit to hold it. Mr. HARRISON's plan retains the principle of Congressional selection and appointment, and makes a man who shall not be selected by him for office. President HAYES has thus far put this Congressional dictation at defiance. In one case the Senate refused to consent to an appointment he had made, and under the Tenure-of-Office law—a law of most questionable constitutionality—has kept a man in office after the President had decided him unfit to hold it. Mr. HARRISON's plan retains the principle of Congressional selection and appointment, and makes a man who shall not be selected by him for office. President HAYES has thus far put this Congressional dictation at defiance. In one case the Senate refused to consent to an appointment he had made, and under the Tenure-of-Office law—a law of most questionable constitutionality—has kept a man in office after the President had decided him unfit to hold it. Mr. HARRISON's plan retains the principle of Congressional selection and appointment, and makes a man who shall not be selected by him for office. President HAYES has thus far put this Congressional dictation at defiance. In one case the Senate refused to consent to an appointment he had made, and under the Tenure-of-Office law—a law of most questionable constitutionality—has kept a man in office after the President had decided him unfit to hold it. Mr. HARRISON's plan retains the principle of Congressional selection and appointment, and makes a man who shall not be selected by him for office. President HAYES has thus far put this Congressional dictation at defiance. In one case the Senate refused to consent to an appointment he had made, and under the Tenure-of-Office law—a law of most questionable constitutionality—has kept a man in office after the President had decided him unfit to hold it. Mr. HARRISON's plan retains the principle of Congressional selection and appointment, and makes a man who shall not be selected by him for office. President HAYES has thus far put this Congressional dictation at defiance. In one case the Senate refused to consent to an appointment he had made, and under the Tenure-of-Office law—a law of most questionable constitutionality—has kept a man in office after the President had decided him unfit to hold it. Mr. HARRISON's plan retains the principle of Congressional selection and appointment, and makes a man who shall not be selected by him for office. President HAYES has thus far put this Congressional dictation at defiance. In one case the Senate refused to consent to an appointment he had made, and under the Tenure-of-Office law—a law of most questionable constitutionality—has kept a man in office after the President had decided him unfit to hold it. Mr. HARRISON's plan retains the principle of Congressional selection and appointment, and makes a man who shall not be selected by him for office. President HAYES has thus far put this Congressional dictation at defiance. In one case the Senate refused to consent to an appointment he had made, and under the Tenure-of-Office law—a law of most questionable constitutionality—has kept a man in office after the President had decided him unfit to hold it. Mr. HARRISON's plan retains the principle of Congressional selection and appointment, and makes a man who shall not be selected by him for office. President HAYES has thus far put this Congressional dictation at defiance. In one case the Senate refused to consent to an appointment he had made, and under the Tenure-of-Office law—a law of most questionable constitutionality—has kept a man in office after the President had decided him unfit to hold it. Mr. HARRISON's plan retains the principle of Congressional selection and appointment, and makes a man who shall not be selected by him for office. President HAYES has thus far put this Congressional dictation at defiance. In one case the Senate refused to consent to an appointment he had made, and under the Tenure-of-Office law—a law of most questionable constitutionality—has kept a man in office after the President had decided him unfit to hold it. Mr. HARRISON's plan retains the principle of Congressional selection and appointment, and makes a man who shall not be selected by him for office. President HAYES has thus far put this Congressional dictation at defiance. In one case the Senate refused to consent to an appointment he had made, and under the Tenure-of-Office law—a law of most questionable constitutionality—has kept a man in office after the President had decided him unfit to hold it. Mr. HARRISON's plan retains the principle of Congressional selection and appointment, and makes a man who shall not be selected by him for office. President HAYES has thus far put this Congressional dictation at defiance. In one case the Senate refused to consent to an appointment he had made, and under the Tenure-of-Office law—a law of most questionable constitutionality—has kept a man in office after the President had decided him unfit to hold it. Mr. HARRISON's plan retains the principle of Congressional selection and appointment, and makes a man who shall not be selected by him for office. President HAYES has thus far put this Congressional dictation at defiance. In one case the Senate refused to consent to an appointment he had made, and under the Tenure-of-Office law—a law of most questionable constitutionality—has kept a man in office after the President had decided him unfit to hold it. Mr. HARRISON's plan retains the principle of Congressional selection and appointment, and makes a man who shall not be selected by him for office. President HAYES has thus far put this Congressional dictation at defiance. In one case the Senate refused to consent to an appointment he had made, and under the Tenure-of-Office law—a law of most questionable constitutionality—has kept a man in office after the President had decided him unfit to hold it. Mr. HARRISON's plan retains the principle of Congressional selection and appointment, and makes a man who shall not be selected by him for office. President HAYES has thus far put this Congressional dictation at defiance. In one case the Senate refused to consent to an appointment he had made, and under the Tenure-of-Office law—a law of most questionable constitutionality—has kept a man in office after the President had decided him unfit to hold it. Mr. HARRISON's plan retains the principle of Congressional selection and appointment, and makes a man who shall not be selected by him for office. President HAYES has thus far put this Congressional dictation at defiance. In one case the Senate refused to consent to an appointment he had made, and under the Tenure-of-Office law—a law of most questionable constitutionality—has kept a man in office after the President had decided him unfit to hold it. Mr. HARRISON's plan retains the principle of Congressional selection and appointment, and makes a man who shall not be selected by him for office. President HAYES has thus far put this Congressional dictation at defiance. In one case the Senate refused to consent to an appointment he had made, and under the Tenure-of-Office law—a law of most questionable constitutionality—has kept a man in office after the President had decided him unfit to hold















